

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 16 are amended, and claims 23 and 24 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Examiner Interview

Applicants appreciate the interview granted by the Examiner in charge of this application. In the interview, the Examiner stated that if independent claims 1 and 16 were amended to recite “wherein the one end of the inlet pipe is located at a first portion of the inlet pipe and the one end of the outlet pipe is located at a first portion of the outlet pipe and the first portion of the outlet pipe is parallel to the first portion of the inlet pipe within the sound deadening space”, the claims of this application would overcome the cited prior art.

As noted above, claims 1 and 16 have been amended in this manner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ide (US 6,361,290) in view of Todescat et al. (US 4,911,619). Claims 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 2004/0179955) in view of Todescat.

Applicants submit that the claims of this application are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites a hermetic compressor wherein one end of an inlet pipe is located at a first portion of the inlet pipe and one end of an outlet pipe is located at a first portion of the outlet pipe and the first portion of the outlet pipe is parallel to the first portion of the inlet pipe within the sound deadening space.

As discussed with the Examiner, the cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a compressor. In particular, see Fig. 1 of Ide and Fig. 3 of Todescat. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior.

With regard to independent claim 16, Applicants submit that independent claim 16 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art for similar reasons to those discussed above. Namely, the cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious a hermetic compressor wherein one end of an inlet pipe is located at a first portion of the inlet pipe in the sound deadening space and one end of an outlet pipe is located at a first portion of the outlet pipe in the

sound deadening space and the first portion of the outlet pipe is parallel to the first portion of the inlet pipe within the sound deadening space, as required by independent claim 16. In particular, see Fig. 4 of Lee and Fig. 3 of Todescat.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ko INAGAKI et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2011.08.12 13:50:28 -04'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell
Registration No. 46,402
Attorney for Applicants

JJH/etc
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 12, 2011